



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,994	12/27/2000	Douglas B. Quine	F-240	6431
919	7590	09/06/2007		
PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P.O. BOX 3000 MSC 26-22 SHELTON, CT 06484-8000			EXAMINER LEE, TOMMY D	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,994

Applicant(s)

QUINE, DOUGLAS B.

Examiner

Thomas D. Lee

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7,12-23 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7,12-23 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is responsive to Applicant's AMENDMENT, filed June 19, 2007. Claims 1, 5, 7, 12-23 and 25 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5, 7, 12-23 and 25 (current amendment, at page 7) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1, 5, 7, 12-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,438,433 (Reifman et al., hereinafter Reifman) in view of U.S. Patent 6,170,744 (Lee et al., hereinafter Lee).

For claim 1, Reifman teaches a method of authenticating information communicated between a first communication device and a second communication device via a communications network, comprising the steps of: a. receiving input data and generating facsimile information in a first format by said first communication device from said input data; b. processing said input data to compute an encrypted checksum; c. convolving said facsimile information with said encrypted checksum data to produce convolved data (Col 23 Line 68-Col 24 Line 16); d. decrypting, at said second communication device, said encrypted checksum; e. computing a checksum of said

input data received at said second communications device; and f. alerting a recipient at said second communication device in the event of a mismatch between said checksum data computed in step (e) and said decrypted checksum data in step (d) by clearly marking the received input data indicating a tamper condition (Col 48 Lines 48-59).

Claim 1 has been amended to now recite the step of "clearly marking a *print out* of the received input data indicating a tamper condition." It does not appear that Reifman teaches or suggests overlaying a tamper indication message on the fax print out. However, the clear marking of a tampered document is well known in the art. Lee discloses a method wherein a checksum is computed on a decrypted document, and if there is a mismatch, the document is flagged as possibly fraudulent or corrupt and marked for further intervention (column 12, line 54 – column 13, line 3). The clear marking of the document in such a manner enables a person receiving the document to determine that a document may be corrupted simply by looking at it, thereby avoiding confusion that may arise if there were no marking on the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of applicant's invention, to have modified the teaching of Reifman, by providing a step for clearly marking the corrupted document, as taught by Lee.

Regarding claim 5, Reifman teaches the method of claim 4, wherein a database system is communicatively coupled to said second communication device (Col 51 Lines 3-6).

Considering claim 7, Reifman teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of: configuring an e-mail system for receiving and displaying an alert message to said recipient along with said received input data (Col 61. Lines 7-10; EFAX).

For claim 12, Reifman teaches wherein the convolved data is transmitted to the second facsimile communication devices as an e-mail attachment (Col 48 Lines 60-64).

For claim 13, Reifman discloses sending the convolved data to a third facsimile communication device (Col 1 Lines 44-54; Col 3 Lines 41-51).

Considering claim 14, Reifman discloses receiving a user name and password from a user with the second facsimile communication device (Col 10 Lines 33-39).

Considering claim 15, Reifman discloses a method of authenticating a facsimile document communicated between a first facsimile communication device and a second facsimile communication device via a communications network, comprising the steps of: receiving at the second facsimile communications device via a communication network, comprising the steps of: receiving at the second facsimile communications device transmitted data including a digital representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data associated with the digital representation of the entire facsimile document in a first format sent by said first communication device (Col 23 Line 68- Col 24 Line 16); processing said transmitted data ,at said second communication device, to extract a digital representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data; decrypting, at said second communication device, said encrypted authentication data; computing, at said second communication device, a comparison version of the authentication data using the digital

Art Unit: 2625

representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data; and alerting a recipient at said second communication device in the event of a mismatch between said authentication data and said comparison version of the authentication data by clearly marking the received input data indicating a tamper condition (Col 48 Lines 48-59).

Claim 15 has been amended to now recite the step of “clearly marking *a print out* of the received input data indicating a tamper condition.” As mentioned above with respect to claim 1, it does not appear that Reifman teaches or suggests overlaying a tamper indication message on the fax print out. However, the clear marking of a tampered document is well known in the art. Lee discloses a method wherein a checksum is computed on a decrypted document, and if there is a mismatch, the document is flagged as possibly fraudulent or corrupt and marked for further intervention (column 12, line 54 – column 13, line 3). The clear marking of the document in such a manner enables a person receiving the document to determine that a document may be corrupted simply by looking at it, thereby avoiding confusion that may arise if there were no marking on the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of applicant’s invention, to have modified the teaching of Reifman, by providing a step for clearly marking the corrupted document, as taught by Lee.

For claim 16, Reifman teaches the method of claim 4, wherein a database system is communicatively coupled to said second communication device (Col 51 Lines 3-6).

Regarding claim 17, Reifman teaches further comprising the step of: configuring an e-mail system for receiving and displaying an alert message to said recipient along with said received input data (Col 61 Lines 7-10; EFAX).

Considering claim 18, Reifman discloses wherein the step of alerting the recipient at said second facsimile communication device in the event of a mismatch includes a printing a clear mark across a print out of the received input data indicating a tamper condition (Col 48 Lines 35-37, 52-56 and Col 49 Lines 12-18; user has option to choose "print on the IFAX").

For claim 19, Reifman teaches wherein the step of alerting the recipient at said second facsimile communication device in the event of a mismatch includes displaying a clear mark across a computer display of the received input data indicating a tamper condition (Col 47 Lines 64-65 and Col 48 Lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 20, Reifman teaches wherein the convolved data is transmitted to the second facsimile communication devices as an e-mail attachment (Col 48 Lines 60-64).

Considering claim 21, Reifman discloses sending the convolved data to a third facsimile communication device (Col 1 Lines 44-54; Col 3 Lines 41-51).

For claim 22, Reifman discloses receiving a user name and password from a user with the second facsimile communication device (Col 10 Lines 33-39).

For claim 23, Reifman teaches a method of authenticating a facsimile document communicated between a first facsimile communication device and a second facsimile communication device via a communications network, comprising the steps of: receiving

at the second facsimile communications device transmitted data including a digital representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data associated with the facsimile document and consisting of a single encrypted checksum of the entire facsimile document in a first format sent by said first communication device; processing said transmitted data, at said second communication device, to extract a digital representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data (Col 23 Line 68- Col 24 Line 16); decrypting, at said second communication device, said encrypted authentication data; computing, at said second communication device, a comparison version of the authentication data using the a digital representation of the entire facsimile document and convolved encrypted authentication data; and alerting a recipient at said second communication device in the event of a mismatch between said authentication data and said comparison version of the authentication data (Col 48 Lines 48-59), wherein the step of alerting the recipient at said second facsimile communication device in the event of a mismatch includes a clear mark across a print out of the received input data indication a tamper condition (Col 48 Lines 35-37,52-56 and Col 49 Lines 12-18; user has option to choose "print on the IFAX").

Claim 23 has been amended to now recite the step of "printing a mark across a print out of the received input data *clearly* indicating a tamper condition." As mentioned above with respect to claims 1 and 15, it does not appear that Reifman teaches or suggests overlaying a tamper indication message on the fax print out. However, the clear marking of a tampered document is well known in the art. Lee discloses a method

wherein a checksum is computed on a decrypted document, and if there is a mismatch, the document is flagged as possibly fraudulent or corrupt and marked for further intervention (column 12, line 54 – column 13, line 3). The clear marking of the document in such a manner enables a person receiving the document to determine that a document may be corrupted simply by looking at it, thereby avoiding confusion that may arise if there were no marking on the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of applicant's invention, to have modified the teaching of Reifman, by providing a step for clearly marking the corrupted document, as taught by Lee.

Regarding claim 25, Reifman discloses the step of alerting the recipient at said second facsimile communication device in the event of a mismatch includes displaying a clear mark across a computer display of the received input data indicating a tamper condition (Col 47 Lines 64-65 and Col 48 Lines 52-56).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2625

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thomas D Lee
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2625

tdl
August 31, 2007